



## Meeting Summary May 11, 2016

### Attendance

Panel Members: Hank Alinger, Chair  
Don Taylor, Vice Chair  
Phil Engelke  
Bob Gorman  
Sujit Mishra  
Julie Wilson

DPZ Staff: Kristin O'Connor, Yvette Zhou

### The Legacy at Ellicott's Retreat- #16-09

Owner/Developer: Commercial Contractors, Inc.  
Architect & Planner: NVR, Inc.  
Engineer: KCI Technologies, Inc.  
Landscape Architect: NVR, Inc.

1. **Call to Order** – DAP Chair Mr. Hank Alinger opened the meeting at 7:31 pm, calling for introductions of the panel, staff and project team.
2. **Review of The Legacy at Ellicott's Retreat- #16-09**– Mr. Tim Miller, the project engineer from KCI Technologies, Inc. offered an overview of the proposed age-restricted condominium project. He stated the subject site is approximately 10 acres is located on Carl's Court and North Ridge Road, north of US Route 40 and east of Route 29.

Mr. Miller stated the previous builder, Beazer Homes, designed the property based on footprint for 6 buildings that contain 162 units (28 units per building) with parking on first floor for about 24 spaces and the rest of the parking was approved in surface spaces and garages. Mr. Miller stated that the infrastructure was approved in the site development plan and construction started last June. According to project engineer, the property was graded and the streets were boxed in and ready for concrete. The water, sewer, utilities and most of the storm water management facilities are installed on the site. In January, Beazer Homes was no longer interested in property, according to Mr. Miller, and so the project team focused on designing the site on what was already built. He showed slides of amount of infrastructure that has been installed onsite, including different viewpoints from all angles of the property. Mr. Miller stated that the new plan proposes to stay within the existing cleared site and retaining walls. The storm water management will not change and the disturbance will remain as-is.

The new proposed architecture has gone from six buildings to 10 buildings including 16 units per building for a total 160 units. Mr. Miller stated that NVR, Inc., the new builder, wanted as much parking as possible and has proposed two parking spaces per unit (only required to provide 1.3 spaces per unit). There are 320 parking spaces onsite for the development. The engineer discussed the current design of site is to place the units on the pads of the existing layouts and to soften the site, bioretention areas would be located along the edges of the building and would include a mix of trees including river birches to further soften the sides of the buildings. The project team suggested planting the areas with typical SWM landscaping and other trees such as red oaks. Mr. Miller stated that KCI tried to change the orientation some of the buildings but because there were garages and parking on both sides of the buildings it would have required an access road in the back of the buildings and would have pushed the buildings into the roadways.

Mr. Kevin Scott, General Manager of Land Acquisition of NVR, Inc. and Mr. Dave Simon, Director of Architecture of NVR, Inc. presented the design of the proposed units. Mr. Scott stated that the product is a standard design consisting of 16-unit garden condo currently being built in Waverly Woods. The only difference is there will be 16 garages (one per unit) on the first level which is a new design for NVR, Inc. There are two units on left and two on the right. The exterior facade added a canopy design to accentuate the entrance in line of a cottage theme. The tapered columns and stone/siding combo provides high level of contrast. Rear elevation did not have depth in rear exit door so shutters will be used. Mr. Scott pointed out the side entrances in the side elevation sheet and described how residents will enter into a corridor that feeds the garages and core area. According to the NVR architect, the top level windows are for the loft units, the smaller windows are the bathrooms, and lower level windows have shutters to hide the ground floor garages.

DAP Vice Chair, Mr. Don Taylor, asked about the height of the buildings. Mr. Simon, from NVR, Inc., responded that the buildings are approximately 59 feet 4 inches. Mr. Taylor stated the side elevation appears to be contorted, stretched on the design plan which Mr. Simon acknowledged. DAP member Ms. Julie Wilson asked how the exit relates to bioswale Mr. Simon responded that the residents can come out either side. Mr. Taylor asked why the bioswale was not on the back side as opposed to the front side. Mr. Miller responded there is already a bioswale on the back of the building in the original design. Mr. Miller pointed to the locations on the PowerPoint slide.

Mr. Simon continued with the floor plans which feature two bed/two baths, a central space with a very open, flexible floor plan with exterior balcony. Bathrooms/showers features are indicative of what consumers are buying. Top units have loft space that is open and overlooks to the floor below.

NVR's Mr. Scott discussed the proposed clubhouse and added that a detailed plan was not available yet. He showed a photo of the existing clubhouse just built in Waverly Woods and suggested that the clubhouse would be similar to the proposed clubhouse in the development but would be a scaled back version to fit the property. The design plan shows locker rooms but they will not be included in the proposed clubhouse since no pool is anticipated. NVR suggested that they would like to include an exercise area in the proposed clubhouse with approximately 1000 sq. ft. with automated program that displays on a big screen to lead individualized exercise classes. The rest would have open space with recreation area, a kitchenette, perhaps a small office for property management, game table, large outdoor patio space both indoor/outdoor activities. DAP Chair, Mr. Hank Alinger asked about the clubhouse's size. Mr. Scott responded that it will be 25x60 or slightly above as it will be representative of the development once a detailed design plan is available.

DAP Chair Mr. Alinger directed staff to present its comments on the project. Ms. Kristin O'Connor, DPZ, highlighted that DAP had seen this project in 2014 and at that time, the Panel members provided the following points:

1. Consider details that make the site a special place.
2. Place shade trees in front of the units and in other places to soften the overall context of development.
3. Use courtyards to reinforce a sense of interest; use special paving for courtyards and for visitor parking.
4. Provide additional walkways, trails and connections to adjacent neighborhoods.

Ms. O'Connor stated that the reason why this plan is back before the DAP once again is because the site has new engineering and field changes. She confirmed that the *Route 40 Design Guidelines Manual* makes recommendations on buildings, parking and pedestrian circulation/connectivity. Ms. O'Connor stated that the *Manual* recommends that buildings have a high level of interests on the ground floor and include architectural design elements such as openings, columns, and changes to façade depths. She noted that the *Manual* recommends the construction of environmentally sustainable buildings in the Route 40 Corridor. Ms. O'Connor recommended that DAP discuss the following with applicant:

1. Consider the site and building orientation
2. Consider constructing the buildings in a sustainable way
3. Consider the clubhouse and patio location and function in greater detail as it is the main amenity for the community
4. Consider additional landscaping and greenery in the rear of Buildings# 1 and #2.
5. Consider relocating the parking in front of the clubhouse as the area should be an open space area for pedestrians
6. Consider adding landscaping/fencing/screening to soften the visual impact of parking area of the entrance of the parking
7. Consider showing the existing sidewalk on Carl's Court and North Ridge Road on the site plan to indicate how the proposed sidewalk will connect to the sidewalk network nearby including the adjacent office parcel

DAP Member Mr. Bob Gorman asked for clarification on the retaining walls along the edge of the property and if there were restrictions for the development to move further north. Mr. Miller, the engineer, responded there was a slope on the north side that may prevent the building from moving. Mr. Gorman asked if the open space was located where the central pond was shown on the applicant's presentation. Mr. Miller responded with an affirmative and that it will be a dry pond once the site is developed.

Mr. Alinger highlighted that this project was in a unique situation and that the developer had his hands tied trying to retrofit another builder's product on the site. He agreed with staff's comment for the need to revisit the orientation of buildings since revised plan has the ends of the buildings exposed. Mr. Alinger also asked if there is an opportunity for Building #6 to be turned 90 degrees and suggested reorienting the adjacent parking lot. Mr. Miller said it was considered but it really impacted the parking on the other side.

Mr. Alinger also agreed with staff's comment about eliminating the pull-in parking spaces in front of the clubhouse area to open it up to pedestrians for open space. Mr. Gorman said it's such a restricted site and he agreed that with losing the parking in front of the clubhouse. He suggested that the project team should redo the parking counts for the entire site to 1.8 parking spaces per unit and agreed that 1.3 per unit was too low. Mr. Gorman suggested that the clubhouse could go anywhere on the site

DAP Member Mr. Phil Engelke said the bigger issue is seeing the ends of building instead of the front façade that feature the detailed architectural designs. Mr. Gorman agreed with enhancing the ends of the buildings to include more architectural details. Mr. Gorman suggested that moving the clubhouse and, reorienting Building #6 to match the other buildings would result in a loss of a row of parking but it was doable.

Mr. Taylor suggested that the middle open space was a void and that reorienting the buildings was improbable but enhancing the ends to look like fronts was the right way to develop this site. Mr. Engelke stated that the developer should spend money on the stone on the ends of the buildings. DAP Member Julie Wilson stated that it would be nice if the buildings could be pushed back an additional 5' to soften the end elevations with street trees. Mr. Alinger suggested putting the bioretention areas on the back of the buildings to allow for more street trees to be planted in the front.

Mr. Alinger said the applicant should consider eliminating the parking in front of the clubhouse and adding parking to the interior triangle area and that Building #3 should have landscaping to give a "sense of entrance". He suggested a sidewalk around the interior triangle open space and adding decking over the bioswale with benches for a seating area that will help market the community.

Ms. Wilson stated that the alley needs to be both “a space and a place”. She advised adding greater access to the spaces between buildings as there isn’t anything currently proposed.

Mr. Engelke suggested using signature pavers. Mr. Gorman agreed and said that changing the paving to suggest that it is not only a vehicular alley but an ally for people. The project’s engineer said the plan calls for pavers in areas in front of the garages to break up the paving. Using textured paving throughout the alley, according to Ms. Wilson, would make it a “courtyard with cars” and celebrate the space with a nice alley. Mr. Engelke agreed with making the alleys special. DAP members suggested a European look for the alleys with a change of pavement at the entrance (such as tinted concrete) and an arching terminus with a pergola. Mr. Scott, the architect from NVR, Inc. liked the idea of the alley terminating into a half moon with a trellis and a grill for a nice gathering area and noted that a wider alley between Building #8 and Building #9 could be included to add a courtyard to add another focal point. Mr. Alinger suggested the new courtyard could have grass added.

In terms of screening, Ms. Wilson said there is a need for a front door not just landscape to hide the side elevation. Mr. Alinger commented that so many suggestions are given to the applicant because the plan can be improved to reach the best potential. He concurred with DPZ staff and requested that the sidewalk on the plans need to connect to the roads and adjacent properties. Mr. Miller confirmed that the sidewalk leads out of Carl’s Court and connects to the existing sidewalk on North Ridge Road and connects to the Walmart and other properties.

DAP members agreed that the bioretention landscaping could be upgraded to streetscape with street trees that would make it very elegant and the community more marketable. Ms. Wilson suggested screening the area with tall trees so prospective residents would not have views of US Route 29. Mr. Miller acknowledges the suggestion but stated that the retaining wall would prevent any substantial planting due to the root damage. He also noted that perhaps only fourth floor may see a slight view of the road but not ground floor. Ms. Wilson suggested trees be added in the area.

DAP member Mr. Sujit Mishra asked if the builder was proposing any sustainable approach to their buildings. Mr. Simon said NVR, Inc. is energy star builder. Mr. Mishra asked if the proposed siding is vinyl and Mr. Simon answered that the siding was vinyl.

Mr. Alinger asked if the clubhouse and buildings could be shifted, and the bioswale be relocated. He noted that if more green is retained, it would be more like a passive park and a natural gathering area which is preferred. Mr. Miller responded that the storm water management area has to be left where it was built. Ms. Wilson said the clubhouse needs to relate to the units unique architectural and the design characteristics. The design of the Waverly Woods clubhouse should not be used, according to Ms. Wilson. Mr. Engelke remarked that the clubhouse should use the same vocabulary as the units and the building should be unique which will be helpful when marketing the units.

Mr. Gorman suggested that the development shift northward to take advantage of the additional land to the north. He revisited the notion that the developer should also consider reducing the total number of parking spaces per unit. Due to the amount of changes that were suggested during the meeting, Ms. Wilson requested that the project come back to DAP for review. Before the DAP members could respond, Louis Mangione, President, Commercial Contractors, Inc. came to the table and stated that the last building has a steep hill behind it and rocks were cut out. He stated that if that building is moved further back, it won’t be structurally sound due to buried rocks. Mr. Mangione said that they will look at reorienting the last building within the same area and recalculating parking.

**The DAP adopted the following recommendations for the project. These recommendations will be forwarded to the Director of the Department of Planning and Zoning.**

DAP member Bob Gorman made the following motion:

1. “Applicant to relook at the orientation for Building #6 and what flexibility there is to loosen the plan.”  
Seconded by DAP Vice Chair Mr. Don Taylor.

Vote: 6-0 to approve

DAP Vice Chair Mr. Don Taylor made the following motion:

2. "Applicant reconsiders the end elevation and develop as if it is an entry to the buildings". Seconded by DAP member Phil Engelke.

Vote: 6-0 to approve

DAP member Hank Alinger made the following motion:

3. "The applicant look at additional ways to enhance the central green space as amenity for pedestrians, visitors, for sitting areas." Seconded by DAP Vice Chair Mr. Don Taylor.

Vote: 6-0 to approve

DAP member Julie Wilson made the following motion:

4. "The applicant look at the spaces between the buildings and the paving to make those pedestrian-oriented. Look at street trees, paving to make those more special places." Seconded by DAP member Phil Engelke.

Vote: 6-0 to approve

DAP member Phil Engelke made the following motion:

5. "The applicant look at the detailing in the alleys and also in the building itself, gabling could be introduced at the entries as some sort of an entrance feature/gateway into the project". Seconded by DAP Vice Chair Mr. Don Taylor.

Vote: 6-0 to approve

DAP member Sujit Mishra made the following motion:

6. "The applicant think about the sustainable features of this project as well." Seconded by DAP Chair Mr. Hank Alinger.

Vote: 6-0 to approve

DAP member Julie Wilson made the following motion:

7. "The applicant look at the section by US Route 29 and determine if they need to provide more screening for the housing units by the top corner." Seconded by DAP member Phil Engelke.

Vote: 6-0 to approve

DAP member Bob Gorman made the following motion:

8. "The applicant consider backing off two spaces per unit to give flexibility to make all these changes." Seconded by DAP Vice Chair Mr. Don Taylor.

Vote: 6-0 to approve

DAP member Julie Wilson made the following motion:

9. "The applicant look at the clubhouse design so it's integrated into the architecture of the site." Seconded by DAP Vice Chair Mr. Don Taylor.

Vote: 6-0 to approve

**3. Other Business and Informational Items:**

- a. Ms. Kristin O'Connor, DPZ, asked DAP Members for possible candidates for the replacement of former DAP member, Peggy White, P.E.
- b. Ms. O'Connor provided DAP members a copy of the 2016 Clarksville Pike Streetscape and Design Guidelines.

**4. Call to Adjourn**

DAP Chair Mr. Hank Alinger adjourned the meeting at 8:41 pm.

**5. The record was reopened again at 8:47pm.**

DAP Chair Mr. Hank Alinger reconvened the meeting to allow Ms. Wilson to complete her initial request to have the project come back for DAP review.

**6. Julie Wilson made an additional recommendation that will be forwarded to the Director of the Department of Planning and Zoning:**

DAP member Julie Wilson made the following motion:

10. The applicant to return to the Panel as soon as possible.” Seconded by DAP Chair Mr. Hank Alinger.

Vote: 5-0 to approve, 1 absent

**7. Call to Adjourn**

Mr. Alinger adjourned the meeting at 8:49 pm.